



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.                      | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/627,469                           | 07/25/2003  | Kenneth H. Bronstein | 200206518-1         | 3228             |
| 22879                                | 7590        | 04/14/2008           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY              |             |                      | TRAN, NHAN T        |                  |
| P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
| INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION |             |                      | 2622                |                  |
| FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400          |             |                      |                     |                  |
| NOTIFICATION DATE                    |             | DELIVERY MODE        |                     |                  |
| 04/14/2008                           |             | ELECTRONIC           |                     |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM

mkraft@hp.com

ipa.mail@hp.com

|                              |                        |                     |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |
|                              | 10/627,469             | BRONSTEIN ET AL.    |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |
|                              | NHAN T. TRAN           | 2622                |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2008.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                  2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5,9-13,17-28 and 31-37 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-5,9-13,17-28 and 31-37 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
     1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
     2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
     3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

|  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 1/9/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicants argue that Parulski and Wong teach away from each other. The Applicants further assert that the assignment of metadata to media items after the capture of media items in Wong defeats the essential purpose of Parulski whose purpose is to pre-assign labels for classifying future images. (Remarks, pages 7 & 8).

In response, the Examiner understands the Applicants' arguments but respectfully disagrees.

First of all, Parulski teaches fundamental features including essential limitations of claim 1 for creating text metadata prior to capturing images by entering metadata through a keyboard or mouse of a computer (40). Parulski is just silent as to the metadata includes an audio label. However, Parulski suggests that variations and modifications can be effected by a person of ordinary skill in the art (see Parulski, col. 9, lines 15-20). Secondly, **it is the matter of whether or not Parulski's apparatus could be modified to create an audio label as a part of metadata prior to capturing images?** Absolutely yes, because Parulski does not teach away from this modification as cited in col. 9, lines 15-20 above. Rather, Parulski's apparatus would be improved by such modification to include the audio label as the pre-assigned metadata. Furthermore, Wong is relied upon for the teaching of improvement to metadata by

creating an audio label in addition to text labels, not relied upon for the teaching of assigning audio label before or after capturing images.

In view of the above, the rejection is maintained.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-5, 9, 11, 12, 17-24, 31-34, 36, 37 & 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski et al. (US 6,629,104) in view of Wong et al. (US 2004/0168118).

Regarding claim 1, Parulski discloses a method for associating metadata with captured images, comprising:

an image capture device (a digital camera 10; Fig. 2) receiving the metadata from an external source (i.e., a computer 60 or a removable memory card 30); capturing an image (by CCD image sensor 14) with the image capture device, and the image capture device associating the captured image with the metadata, wherein the metadata is received prior to capturing the image (see col. 2, lines 55-58; col. 5, lines 20-41; col. 6, lines 30-40, wherein the metadata categorization software received and stored in the EPROM 28 of the digital camera 10 also includes predefined labels for the user to

**select**, i.e., best photos, funny photos, etc., in addition to custom labels that are created by the users prior to capturing an image. Note the incorporated reference US 5,477,264 for predefined labels in the disclosure of Parulski).

Parulski does not explicitly disclose that the metadata includes an audio label.

However, Parulski suggests that variations and modifications can be effected by a person of ordinary skill in the art (see Parulski, col. 9, lines 15-20). Furthermore, Wong teaches an imaging device that includes a voice input (350 shown in Fig. 3) to allow the user to create audio label as metadata for annotating or organizing the images (see Wong, [0045]-[0046] and [0062]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to improve the apparatus in Parulski by including an audio sensor for inputting audio data or recognizing a voice input as corresponding to a certain one of plurality of metadata labels so as to allow the user to attach audio label as metadata to images for user convenience in addition to text labels.

Regarding claim 3, Parulski also discloses that the image capture device received the metadata at a public venue (network service provider 70; Fig. 2), and wherein the metadata is associated with the public venue (see col. 5, lines 47-55 and also note the analysis of claim 1).

Regarding claim 4, it is also seen in Parulski that the image capture device receives the metadata by way of a wireline connection (USB cable interface 26/30

shown in Fig. 2) and wherein the external source is a personal computer (computer 40) that accepts inputs from a user (using mouse, keyboard). See col. 4, line 66 – col. 5, line 4, wherein the USB cable is used to transfer data between the camera and computer as an alternative mode without using the memory card 30.

Regarding claim 5, Parulski further discloses the metadata includes a plurality of labels, and wherein the method additionally comprises a user of the image capture device selecting which of the plurality of labels to associate with the image captured by the image capture device (see Figs. 3-7 and col. 7, line 45 – col. 8, line 67).

Regarding claim 9, Parulski clearly discloses that the image captured by the image capture device is a photograph (a digital photograph; col. 3, lines 61-62).

Regarding claim 11, Parulski discloses an image capture device (a digital camera 10 shown in Fig. 2), comprising:

an interface (20/26) that receives a plurality of metadata labels from an external source (removable memory card 30 or computer 40) prior to the image capture device capturing an image; a memory (removable memory 30) that stores the image; and a processor (18) that assigns one or more of the plurality of metadata labels to the image under the control of a user of the image capture device (see Figs. 2-7; col. 2, lines 55-58; col. 3, lines 60-62; col. 5, lines 20-41 and col. 8, lines 57-67). Please note the

combined teaching of Parulski and Wong in claim 1 for the limitation of “at least one of the plurality of metadata labels is an audio label.”

Regarding claim 12, it is clear in Parulski that the image capture device further comprises an optical subsystem (lens 12 shown in Fig. 2) that acquires a photographic image and stored the image in a memory (col. 3, lines 60 – col. 4, line 9).

Regarding claim 17, Parulski further discloses the external source transmits the plurality of metadata labels, and wherein the plurality of metadata labels pertains to a public venue (network service provider 70 shown in Fig. 2) proximate with the image capture device (col. 5, lines 47-55).

Regarding claim 18, it is clearly seen in Parulski that the image capture device further comprises a selector (buttons 24) that enables a user to change the plurality of metadata labels to be associated with an image (col. 8, lines 34-36, 57-67).

Regarding claim 19, this claim is also met by the analysis of claim 1.

Regarding claim 20, since each user using the digital camera 10 can select or create his/her own labels prior to capturing images as illustrated in steps 130, 140, Parulski’s disclosure also encompasses that the interface receives at least one metadata label and associates the at least one metadata label (i.e., People/Susan) with

a first user of the image capture device, and associates at least one other metadata label (i.e., Subjects/Flowers) with a second user of the image capture device (Figs. 4-7).

Regarding claim 21, it is also seen in Parulski that the external source (i.e., a computer 40) is a second image capture device (note that the computer is a second image capture device because it can capture an image by reading image data from a memory card 30 at card reader 48 or USB interface 36; see Fig. 2).

Regarding claim 22, Parulski discloses that the processor (18) executes a conflict-resolution algorithm (Fig. 1) that assigns metadata labels to a captured image based on the definition of the metadata label (see col. 5, lines 20-41, wherein the flowchart shown in Fig. 1 represents a conflict-resolution algorithm executed by the processor 18 of the camera to assign metadata with different labels and sub-labels as shown in Fig. 4 to avoid conflict among the sub-labels in response to the user's input. It is noted that the claim does not require that the processor automatically assigns the metadata labels to the captured image based on the definition of the metadata label. Thus, the claim limitations are broad enough to read on the Parulski's disclosure above).

Regarding claim 23, Parulski discloses an image capture device (a digital camera 10 shown in Fig. 2), comprising:

means (interface 20/26) for receiving and storing a plurality of metadata labels from an external source (col. 5, lines 20-41 and note the analysis of claim 1);

means (18/20) for capturing a plurality of images in memory (col. 3, line 60 – col. 4, line 9);

means (18) for automatically associating at least some of the plurality of stored metadata labels with at least some of the plurality of images captured in memory (see step 210 in Fig. 1 and col. 8, lines 37-46, wherein the metadata labels selected/created beforehand are *automatically* associated with the captured images in step 210 by skipping steps 180-200). Please note the combined teaching of Parulski and Wong in claim 1 for the limitation of “the plurality of metadata labels includes an audio label.”

Regarding claim 24, see the analyses of claims 5 & 18.

Regarding claim 31, Parulski discloses means (communication interface 20/26) for loading a plurality of metadata labels into a second image capture device (see Fig. 2 and col. 5, lines 5-7, wherein a computer captures the images from the camera that includes associated metadata labels selected by the user as discussed above. Thus, the metadata labels are loaded into the computer by this communication).

Regarding claim 32, see the analyses of claims 22 & 31. Note Fig. 4 of Parulski that the conflict of metadata labels may occur in the labels (i.e., People). This conflict is solved by assigning different sub-labels (i.e., Matthew, Susan, Susan’s family, etc.) to

distinguish labels from each other when the labels (i.e., People) in the camera are the same as the labels (i.e. People) in the computer.

Regarding claim 33, see the analyses of claims 11 & 23.

Regarding claim 34, see the analysis of claim 4.

Regarding claims 36 & 37, see the analyses of claims 17 & 18, respectively.

Regarding claim 39, Parulski further discloses that the associating step includes assigning metadata to the captured image by way of the captured image belonging to a collection (e.g., classifications, locations or subjects are selected by the user as a collection) and the metadata has been assigned to the collection (see Fig. 2 and col. 5, lines 20-41).

1. Claims 25 & 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski et al. and Wong et al. and in further view of Leiper (US 6,184,862).

Regarding claim 25, Parulski discloses the means for selecting at least some of the plurality of metadata labels being a button (24 shown in Fig. 2). Parulski and Wong do not explicitly teach that the means for selecting is a thumbwheel.

However, it is well recognized by Leiper that a user interface for an electronic device for selecting images/items on a display device can be implemented by either a button, a thumbwheel or a touchpad (see Leiper, col. 5, lines 41-51).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a thumbwheel as an obvious variant over the button in Parulski and Wong in view of suggestion of Leiper so that the user would be able to quickly roll for selection of the metadata labels.

Regarding claim 26, Parulski discloses the means for selecting at least some of the plurality of metadata labels being a button (24 shown in Fig. 2). Parulski and Wong do not explicitly teach that the means for selecting is a touchpad.

However, it is well recognized by Leiper that a user interface for an electronic device for selecting images/items on a display device can be implemented by either a button, a thumbwheel or a touchpad (see Leiper, col. 5, lines 41-51).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a touchpad as an obvious variant over the button in Parulski and Wong in view of suggestion of Leiper so as to eliminate mechanical component(s) for reliability and compactness.

2. Claims 2, 10, 13, 27, 28 & 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski et al. and Wong et al. and in further view of Aublant et al. (US 2004/0126038).

Regarding claim 27, Parulski is silent about that the means for receiving and storing a plurality of metadata labels includes a wireless interface, and wherein the external source is a public venue transmitter that conveys a wireless signal to the image capture device.

However, Aublant teaches a digital camera (100) that receives and stores metadata from a public venue transmitter (i.e., Smart Tag device 604 shown in Fig. 6A or GPS and other devices shown in Fig. 2) that conveys a wireless signal to the image capture device when the user is within predetermined wireless range or location (see Aublant, abstract and [0014]-[0015] and [0040]). Such implementation of wireless feature enhances mobility and convenience of the camera, i.e., when the camera is used to capture images at theme parks, museums, sport venues, etc., by transmitting metadata wirelessly to the camera to associate with the captured image without manual intervention as taught by Aublant in [0067] & [0014].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art configure the apparatus of Parulski and Wong to include the teaching of Aublant for receiving and storing the metadata labels in the image capture device wirelessly from a public venue transmitter that conveys a wireless signal to the image capture device so as to enhance mobility and convenience for use at various public places for automatically associating the metadata labels to the captured image.

Regarding claim 28, Parulski in view of Aublant as analyzed in claim 27 clearly teaches that the wireless signal conveys the plurality of metadata labels to the image capture device, and wherein the image capture device detects the wireless signal (when the image capture device is within a predetermined wireless range, i.e., Bluetooth, or a predetermined location) and associates at least some of the plurality of metadata labels with at least some of the plurality of images captured in memory upon the detection of the signal (see Aublant, [0014]-[0015]).

Regarding claims 2 & 35, see the analyses of claim 27.

Regarding claims 10 & 13, although Parulski does not explicitly disclose an audio system that acquires an audio image and writes the audio image to a memory, such lack of teaching is compensated by Aublant. As shown in Fig. 1A and [0036], the digital camera 100 is capable of capturing an audio image and recording it into a removable memory.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Parulski, Wong and Aublant to arrive at the Applicant's claimed invention for capturing and recording an audio image into the memory so that a better reproduction of the image would be realized by playing the audio captured along with the image as user desires.

### ***Conclusion***

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NHAN T. TRAN whose telephone number is (571)272-7371. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Ometz can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nhan T. Tran/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2622